

Q55

62-7-57
(?)

Secretary of State that they had not been made aware of conditions in Hungary and

concluded that it was a "no wonder" that Senator Mansfield should be calling for an

investigation of CIA; (d) Robert S. Allen, November 18, alleged that CIA is

"definitely headed for another critical scrutiny at the coming session of Congress", basing the statement on ~~some~~ statements by Senator Mansfield and others; (e)

Senator Mansfield himself was quoted in the press as having said: "We were caught

by surprise in Poland, caught by surprise in Hungary, caught by surprise in the Middle East (New York Post, and Chicago Sun Times November 19); (f) Royce Brier,

in a general discussion of the Agency, said: "...the President and State were again

surprised by an immensely significant event developing in Middle Europe"; (g)

Tom Lambert, reporting on a meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on

November 11, said: "One Senator said CIA Director Allen Dulles was aware in advance

including the Hungarian uprising" of developments in Eastern Europe/(New York Herald Tribune November 13); (h)

Frederick W. Collins (Providence Journal November 21; Richard Wilson (Minneapolis

Tribune November 21, and Robert Roth (Philadelphia Bulletin November 25), all agreed

that CIA had been aware of the situation in Hungary long before the revolt occurred, but (in Mr. Wilson's words) "it was not able to forecast the course of events and the repression imposed by the Soviet Union." All three thought that it would have been extremely difficult for any intelligence agency to predict the exact timing of such an event as the Hungarian revolt; (i) ~~an~~ is an unsigned article published November 26, the Providence Journal expressed neither agreement nor disagreement with Senator Mansfield's statement about a CIA failure in Hungary, but thought a properly conducted inquiry into CIA's performance regarding Poland, Hungary, and the Middle East might result in "...a better judgment on the value of Senator Mansfield's

proposal."

proposal." (f) a strong defense of CIA in the matter of
predicted, foreign, and internal security. The Washington
Post and Times Herald, December 27,
1950, page 1, column 1, article 1, "The
CIA's Role in the Defense of the Nation," by
the New York Times, December 27,
1950, page 1, column 1, article 1, "The
CIA's Role in the Defense of the Nation," by

Daily Worker which follow the official Moscow line to the extent of indiscriminately

attacking CIA as part of the alleged "Project X" plot against Hungary and the

"People's Democracies". For other Daily Worker
Comment. See Tab D

3. US press and radio discussion of Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America, and allegedly associated organizations, where these are mentioned by name numbered forty-nine items for the period October 23 to December 17, 1956.

The points of view taken in these discussions were many and varied, but might be roughly divided in accordance with those that held that RFE-VOA: (a) played a not uncommendable part in giving encouragement to the Hungarians; (b) may soon be investigated in connection with their activities related to Hungary; (c) incited the Hungarians to revolt; (d) did not incite the Hungarians to revolt; (e) had nothing to do with the revolt, which was solely the work of the Hungarian people; and (f) betrayed the trust of the Hungarians by leading them to expect military backing from the United States.

(a) In the first category (involving commendation of RFE) can be seen such comments as those by: Ed Sullivan in the New York Daily News; (October 29) a news story in the New York Herald Tribune (October 30); C.L. Sulzberger in the New York Times on the relative usefulness of RFE and VOA (November 3); and a Life editorial commenting primarily on RFE's success in Poland (November 5). It may be noted that all these were published during the first twelve days after the revolt. Another article in somewhat the same vein came later (November 30) in the Christian Science Monitor

where Ernest S. Pisko offered a strong defense of RFE in the context of the Hungarian revolt.

(b) Among those who spoke in terms of an investigation of VOA-RFE (usually to be undertaken by Congress) were: Douglas Larson in the New York World Telegram and Sun; the Chicago Daily Tribune (editorial); Marquis Childs in the Washington Post and Times Herald; and a news item in the Baltimore Sun (quoting Senator Humphrey). These comments were dated November 20 and December 4, 5, and 10 respectively. Mention was also made (Washington Post November 20 and UP Wire December 4) of a proposed ~~new~~ investigation of RFE by the West

German government in connection with RFE's West German license.

(c) Seven items from newspapers could be taken as implying that RFE had a part in brining about the Hungarian uprising: the Washington Post and Times Herald of November 18; Dean James A. Pike of the New York Cathedral quoted in the New York Times November 19 and December 7; a Chicago Tribune editorial of November 21, a passing reference by Chalmers Roberts in the Washington Post of November 28; a discussion by Michael O'Neill in the New York Daily News of November 28, and an editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of

(d) ~~This message is not to be released~~ In various ways, commentators undertook a denial of charges that RFE had deliberately or actually incited the Hungarians to revolt, among them: John MacCormac in the New York Times of November 16, citing the experience of a Hungarian student; Richard L. Lyons in the Washington Post of November 21 quoting an unqualified denial by Ferenc Nagy; a New York Daily News editorial of December 13; Ed Sullivan, quoting RFE officials in the New York Daily News on December 14; the New York Times in an editorial of December 15; Time Magazine for December 17, a letter to the New York Times by an RFE employee of December 17; and an editorial in the Washington Post of December 17 (which, however, ~~quotes~~

criticizes General William Donovan for aiding Communist propaganda through his statements about sending arms to Hungary).

(e) Not only were there plain denials of any complicity on the part of RFE, but there were indignant denials to the effect that to give credit to an outside broadcasting agency for what was a wholly indigenous revolt was to insult the brave people of Hungary. Examples may be seen in: Wellington Long in the Washington Daily News of November 14; Time Magazine for November 26 quoting a Hungarian, Istvan Jankowich; ~~and~~ (less directly) a Hungarian student speaking before Georgetown University November 27, and an article in the Reporter by Leslie B. Bain of December 13 *quoted in the Washington Post* quoting Bela Kovacs.

~~criticizes General William Donovan for adding Communist propaganda through state
his statements about sending arms to Hungary.)~~

(6) A popular variant on the theme that RFE had deliberately incited revolt held that RFE not only encouraged an uprising but led its listeners to believe that the US would provide physical aid once the revolt had started, thus embittering the Hungarian revolutionaries when they found no such aid forthcoming. Examples of this are to be seen in: a brief story in the Baltimore Sun of November 5 quoting two Austrians to this effect; Ludwell Denny in the Washington Daily News of November 6; Ilona Massey quoted by the UP November 21; Drew Pearson on November 23; a letter to the Washington Post of November 26 signed by Julius Epstein; a New Republic editorial of November 26; Chet Huntley speaking over NBC about this time; a letter signed by Trevor Williams in the Washington Post of November 27; John MacCormac in the St. Louis *Michael O'Halloran in the New York Daily News of the same day;* Post Dispatch of November 28; the Reporter of November 29; Anna Kethley, Hungarian rebel leader quoted on November 29 and 30 in the Washington Star, ~~and~~ Washington Post, and New York Times; a letter to the Christian Science Monitor signed by a former Czech official (Pavel Korbel); Russell Jones in the Washington Daily News of December 12, and Walter Ridder in the New Republic of December 17.

4. At least two comment~~son~~ mentioning RFE in American papers seemed to give confirmation to favorite Communist propaganda themes: the Wall Street

Journal's statement of November 30 in reference to the Free Europe Committee,

that "Its bills have been picked up for the most part by such corporations as

(the reference to this in the Wall Street Journal)
Standard Oil of New Jersey, U. S. Steel and Ford Motor Company" and a statement

in the National Review of December 15 regarding RFE, asking among other things:

"Is it a stalking-horse for the more adventurous ideas of the CIA?" (For

Standard Moscow propaganda charging that RFE was financed partly by big American

is available in
corporations and that CIA had a part in its activities, see Tab C below)

In addition to the above-cited items dealing directly and by name with the two problems under discussion, there are available about 300 items providing covering the same period and providing background information. These are organized and summarized as:

Tab A. Public Comments by US Officials

Tab B Public comments by US and other Western Newspapers, Exiled Leaders, and Unofficial Organizations and Spokesmen

Tab C Communist Comment from the USSR Directly

Tab D ~~Other~~ Communist Comment, ~~mainly from Eastern Europe and the~~
~~Far East~~ Satellite and Western Countries

Tab E Public Comments by Asian Governments, Press Organizations, and Leaders

Tab F Public Comments on Hungary and RFE, ~~January-October 1956~~ before the start of the Revolt (January-October 1956)

Among possibly relevant items not contained in this compilation are:

- (a) battle news and "combat intelligence" on the revolt; (b) the plea of Hungarian rebels for US help; (c) intelligence exploitation of Hungarian refugees in the weeks after November 4; (d) the security problems of the US and other

Western nations in handling such refugees, and (a) later RFE and VOA broadcasts and broadcast policies in the weeks after the original uprising.